UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,993	10/12/2004	Winfried Stubbe	PAT-01026	8766
26922 7590 01/17/2007 BASF CORPORATION 1609 BIDDLE AVENUE MAIN BUILDING WYANDOTTE, MI 48192			EXAMINER	
			EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
W 17(100) 1E, MI 40172			1713	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) M Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10% 112204.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-20, drawn to an aqueous dispersion.

Group II, claim(s) 21, drawn to a process for preparing the aqueous dispersion of Invention I.

Group III, claim(s) 22, drawn to a method of applying the aqueous dispersion of Invention I.

Group IV, claim(s) 23, drawn to another method of applying the aqueous dispersion of Invention I.

- 2. The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claim 1, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over US 6,599,631. Consequently, the special technical feature which links the claims, the aqueous dispersion, does not provide a contribution to the prior art, so unity of invention is lacking.
- 3. During a telephone conversation with Anne Sabourin on 1/5/07, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-20.

Application/Control Number: 10/510,993

Art Unit: 1713

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 21-23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1 and 3-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kambe et al. (USPN 6,599,631).

In the abstract, col. 5, lines 31-40, col. 6, lines 41-47 and col. 18, line 65 to col. 20, line 7, Kambe et al. teach an aqueous dispersion for preparing a composite comprising a hydrophilic polymer, such an polyacrylic acid or polyamide, a surface-

Application/Control Number: 10/510,993

Art Unit: 1713

modified inorganic nanoparticles stabilized in a dispersion, exemplified by gamma alumina particles at pH 3-4 and Titanium Oxide at pH 7, all in combination with a crosslinking agent, which has chelating ligand properties.

Thus, the requirements for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are met.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kambe et al.

While Kambe et al. may not expressly teach the electrophoretic mobility properties in the claimed dispersion, it is reasonable that the dispersion of Kambe et al. would possess the presently claimed properties since the composition of the dispersion in Kambe et al. is essentially the same as the claimed composition and the USPTO does not have at its disposal the tools or facilities deemed necessary to make physical determinations of the sort. In any event, an otherwise old composition is not patentable regardless of any new or unexpected properties. In re Fitzgerald et al , 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

Even if assuming that the prior art references do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102, it would still have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time

Application/Control Number: 10/510,993

Art Unit: 1713

the invention was made, to arrive at the same inventive composition because the disclosure of the inventive subject matter appears within the generic disclosure of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

KCE